



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Sup. Ct. 394. Private employment agencies are regulated by statute in at least thirteen states and such statutes have been upheld, the purpose of preventing fraud being a sufficient justification for the exercise of the police power. *Brazee v. Michigan* (1916) 241 U. S. 340, 36 Sup. Ct. 561. The Washington statute purports to regulate private employment agencies but it was alleged that its actual operation would practically prohibit them, as such agencies could scarcely exist without the privilege of collecting fees from those seeking employment. Yet, have such agencies any constitutional right to exist? There seems to have been ample evidence of such evils as would render them fit subjects for the police power; and it was primarily for the state legislature to determine how drastic a remedy was necessary. The statute is not arbitrary according to the test laid down in *Lindsley v. Natural Carbonic Co.* (1911) 220 U. S. 61, 31 Sup. Ct. 337. It is submitted that the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Brandeis, remarkable for its modern method of approach and comprehensive marshalling of social data, presents the better view and is more in line with the recent progressive policy of the Supreme Court, which has affirmed with but rare exception state statutes intended to advance "social justice."

S. J. T.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—DUE PROCESS OF LAW—ORDER OF RAILROAD COMMISSION.—The plaintiff railroad having cut down its local passenger service as a war economy measure, was, after a hearing by the State Railroad Commission, ordered to operate additional trains. It appeared that the traffic would not pay a reasonable profit over cost of operation. *Held*, that such a regulation was a violation of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. *Mississippi R. R. Com. v. Mobile & Ohio R. R.* (1917) 37 Sup. Ct. 602. See COMMENTS, p. 121.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—INTERSTATE COMMERCE—FEDERAL EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT EXCLUDING STATE LEGISLATION.—The plaintiff, while in the employ of a railroad company engaged in interstate commerce, suffered personal injuries without negligence on the part of the company. The Federal Employers' Liability Act (Comp. Stat. 1916, §§8657-8665) regulated the liability of such railroad companies to their employees in cases involving negligence, but did not impose any liability in the absence of negligence. The New York Workmen's Compensation Act (N. Y. Laws 1913, ch. 816; Laws 1914, ch. 41 and 316) provided that employees might recover for injuries received in the course of their employment, without regard to the negligence of the employer. *Held*, that the plaintiff could not have the benefit of the New York act since the Federal act was exclusive. Brandeis and Clarke, JJ., *dissenting*. *New York Cent. R. R. Co. v. Winfield* (1917) 37 Sup. Ct. 546.

This decision reverses the holding of the New York Court of Appeals in *Winfield v. New York Cent. R. Co.* (1915) 216 N. Y. 284, 110 N. E. 614, which was adversely criticised in (1916) 25 YALE LAW JOURNAL, 497. For a discussion of a recent Supreme Court decision still further narrowing the field of state legislation of this character, see COMMENTS, next month.